

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan et al. (Hereinafter “Colgan1” US 6,483,498) in view of Furuhashi et al. (Hereinafter “Furuhashi” US 2002/0000979 A1). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C.

5        103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Furuhashi, as applied to claims 1 and 12, and further in view of Colgan et al. (Hereinafter “Colgan2” US 6,117,918 B1). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Furuhashi, as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Hinata (U.S. 6,369,865 B2). Claims 13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

10      103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Mai (US 2004/0141096 A1) and further in view of Furuhashi. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Mai and Furuhashi, as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Colgan2. Claims 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Ikeda et al. (Hereinafter “Ikeda” US 6,504,584) and further in view of Boyd.

15

**1. Request for Continued Examination:**

The applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

20

**2. Rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Furuhashi for reasons of record, as recited on pages 4-6 of the above-indicated Office action.

25

**Response:**

First of all, Claims 1, 13 and 20 are have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Just as Examiner considered in page 2 of the above-indicated Office Action and in the telephone interview dated 5/20/2009 at 9:30pm, Examiner agreed that by replacing the

term “integral” by “one piece”, all existing 103 rejections would be overcame, as the Furuhashi reference does not teach of the protrusion and the second substrate being of **one piece** and is integrating the touch-detecting circuit. Examiner also agreed “one piece” is inherently supported in the specifications of the present application, so there 5 is no new matter issue. Accordingly, the items “integral” recited in claims 1, 13 and 20 is replaced by “one piece”.

Furthermore, according to the said telephone interview, claims 1, 13 and 20 are amended as the following sets of proposed amended claim features:

10       **a plurality of signal connecting contacts disposed on the protrusion of the second substrate, the signal connecting contacts connecting to the detecting circuit for transmitting a plurality of pixel controlling signals and a plurality of touch-detecting signals**

The applicant representative explained to the examiner that the above claim 15 amendment is not adding new matter as this is supported in Present Application’s paragraph [0017] and col. 2, lines 1-4. The examiner agreed that the above claim amendments make sense as it overcomes potential 35 USC 112 issues.

Paragraph [0017] In accordance with the bottom substrate 202 having pixel 20 controlling circuit 218 and the top substrate 204 having detecting layer (touch-detecting circuit) 216, **the bottom substrate 202 and the top substrate 204 have to have signal contacts to transmit every kind of pixel controlling signals and touch-detecting signals. To achieve the demand, the top substrate 204 is not designed to coincide with the bottom substrate 202 completely for setting signal connecting contacts. For instance, the top substrate 204 has at least one protrusion 206 jutting out the bottom substrate 202 and the bottom substrate 202 has at least one protrusion jutting out the top substrate 204. Consequently, the structure is constructed as shown in the FIG. 4 and FIG. 5.** In the FIG. 4 and FIG. 5, the top substrate 202 and the bottom substrate 204 have at least one edge jutting out 25 another substrate for installing signal connecting contacts and connecting to 30

controlling or detecting circuit outside.

“”

In addition, a “negative” feature, one which describe of not having another substrate between the LCD and touch panel layers, is also added in claims 1, 13 and 5 20 to distinguish the present invention from the prior art, as Examiner considered in the telephone interview. This amendment can be supported in figures 2-7 of the present application in contrast with the prior art’s figure 1.

Moreover, since both the first and the second substrates include a plurality of 10 signal connecting contacts, the signal connecting contacts included by the first substrate are replaced by a plurality of first signal connecting contacts in claims 9, 16 and 24, and the signal connecting contacts included by the second substrate are replaced by a plurality of second signal connecting contacts in claims 1, 13 and 20. This amendment is added to overcome potential 35 USC 112 issues, and no new 15 matter is introduced.

Acceptance of the amended claims 1, 9, 13, 16, 20 and 24 is respectfully requested.

20 The present application teaches in the independent claims of a second substrate comprising of color filter substrate, so the touch-detecting circuit is integrated on the color filter substrate, which comprise a protrusion ... On the other hand, Furuhashi is not integrating the touch-detecting circuit on the CF substrate, and in fact the CF substrate does not have any protrusion portion (see Fig. 31). See also element 12 in 25 Fig. 7.

Since this RCE is filed to further pursue patent prosecution by adding the proposed claim amendments of “one piece” and “a plurality of signal connecting contacts disposed on the protrusion of the second substrate, the signal connecting 30 contacts connecting to the detecting circuit for transmitting a plurality of pixel

controlling signals and a plurality of touch-detecting signals”, and adding the proposed “negative” claim feature relating to the missing “middle” substrate, applicant is now believe to receive the allowance of the present claims from Examiner. Thus, Reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested. Since claim 12 is 5 dependent upon claim 1, it should be allowable if claim 1 is allowable. Reconsideration of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

**3. Rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in 10 view of Furuhashi, and further in view of Colgan2 for reasons of record, as recited on pages 6-7 of the above-indicated Office action.

**Response:**

Claim 1 has been amended as mentioned above. Therefore, the combination of 15 Colgan1’s disclosure, Furuhashi’s disclosure and Colgan2’s disclosure does not teach all the limitations disclosed in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 should be allowable in consideration of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Since claim 6 is dependent upon claim 1, it should be allowable if claim 1 is allowable. Reconsideration of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

20

**4. Rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Furuhashi, and further in view of Hinata for reasons of record, as recited on pages 7-8 of the above-indicated Office action.

25

**Response:**

Claim 1 and claim 9 have been amended as mentioned above. Therefore, the combination of Colgan1’s disclosure, Furuhashi’s disclosure and Hinata’s disclosure does not teach all the limitations disclosed in claim 1. Thus, claim 1 should be 30 allowable in consideration of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Since claims 8 and 9 are dependent

upon claim 1, they should be allowable if claim 1 is allowable. Reconsideration of claims 8 and 9 is respectfully requested.

**5. Rejection of claims 13 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

5       Claims 13 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Mai and further in view of Furuhashi for reasons of record, as recited on pages 9-12 of the above-indicated Office action.

**Response:**

10      Claim 13 and claim 16 have been amended as mentioned above. Accordingly, the combination of Colgan1's disclosure, Mai's disclosure and Furuhashi's disclosure does not disclose all the limitations of the structure in claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 should be allowable in consideration of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Reconsideration of claim 13 is respectfully requested.

15

Since claims 15-19 are dependent upon claim 13, they should be allowable if claim 13 is allowable. Reconsideration of claims 15-19 is respectfully requested.

**6. Rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

20      Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colgan1 in view of Mai and Furuhashi, and further in view of Colgan2 for reasons of record, as recited on page 12 of the above-indicated Office action.

**Response:**

25

Claim 13 has been amended as mentioned above. Therefore, the combination of Colgan1's disclosure, Mai's disclosure, Furuhashi's disclosure and Colgan2's disclosure does not disclose all the limitations of the structure in claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 should be allowable in consideration of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Since claim 14 is dependent upon claim 13, it should be allowable if claim 13 is allowable.

Reconsideration of claim 14 is respectfully requested.

**7. Rejection of claims 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):**

Claims 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
5 Colgan1 in view of Ikeda et al. and further in view of Furuhashi for reasons of record,  
as recited on pages 13-15 of the above-indicated Office action.

**Response:**

Claim 20 and claim 24 have been amended as mentioned above. Accordingly, the  
10 combination of Colgan1's disclosure, Ikeda's disclosure and Furuhashi's disclosure  
does not disclose all the limitations of the structure in claim 20. Therefore, claim 20  
should be allowable in consideration of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Reconsideration of claim 20  
is respectfully requested.

15 Since claims 21-27 are dependent upon claim 20, they should be allowable if  
claim 20 is allowable. Reconsideration of claims 21-27 is respectfully requested.

20 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this  
case.

25

30

Sincerely yours,

/Winston Hsu/

Date: 06/01/2009

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,213	09/01/2004	Kei-Hsiung YANG	HANP0001USA	5212
27765	7590	05/29/2009	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			SIM, YONG H	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2629		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/29/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com  
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com  
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/711,213	YANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	YONG SIM	2629	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) YONG SIM. (3) DING TAN.  
 (2) AMR AWAD. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 May 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Furuhashi et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The limitation regarding the protrusion in claim 1 was discussed. Examiner agreed that if the integral protrusion being claim 1 was amended to recite so as to read the protrusion and the second substrate are one piece, meaning common substrate, the claim would overcome the prior art of reference of Furuhashi.

Further Examiner suggested further including limitations regarding the integrated nature of the input-sensor liquid crystal display panel. The Figure 2 of the current application shows the display panel comprising only two substrates with liquid crystal and the detecting layer in between. Examiner respectfully advises the Applicant to draft the claims to clearly and accurately recite so as to be commensurate with the intended scope of the invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Amr Awad/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629
--	--

## **Summary of Record of Interview Requirements**

### **Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### **Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)**

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### **Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

